



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Roman Catholics in England we re-print the following extracts from the above-named publication (the *Rambler*) for the present month, headed:—

"DR. CAHILL'S LETTER ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

"Letter of the Rev. Dr. Cahill to the Rev. J. Burns, Protestant Minister, Whitehaven, 7th December, 1853. Published in the *Whitehaven Herald*, and subsequently in the *Tablet*, of December 17, 1853.

"In our last number we offered our readers some remarks on the various means of which we can avail ourselves for the conversion of Protestants; and we specified certain instruments of conversion, which, as it appears to us, are applicable to the few, but not to the many. Dr. Cahill's letter to Mr. Burns, of Whitehaven, supplies an example of one particular mode of attempting the conversion of unbelievers, which we did not then specify, because, happily it is rare amongst us; and further, because its demerits must be patent to all but the most superficial observers. The letter before us, however, presents so striking an illustration of the perils of platform and newspaper controversy, that it is impossible altogether to pass it over without comment. In thus remarking upon Dr. Cahill's treatment of the awful doctrine which is the subject of his epistle, we shall endeavour to restrain our own language within the closest limits of moderation of which the case will allow, both from respect to Dr. Cahill's sacred office and from a sense of the deep importance of the questions involved. We must, however, candidly acknowledge, that it is with feelings of real shame and distress that we have seen the statements contained in this letter, sent by their author to the columns of a Protestant newspaper, with the professed object of expounding the consistency and rationality of the Catholic faith, in prominent contrast with the absurdities and self-contradictions of Protestant heresies. Of the general tone and style of the letter we need say but a few words. Anything more unfortunately chosen as a means of winning the ignorant or the unbelieving to the faith of the Church, we can scarcely conceive. The devout and charitable Catholic, who, for the sake of the cause defended by the writer, might be disposed to overlook defects produced by the zeal of an advocate, could feel nothing but pain and wonder at Dr. Cahill's words; what, then, must be the impression produced on the minds of those who will make no allowances; who are disposed beforehand to account us ignorant, crafty, and irreverent, and who, while blind to the follies and inconsistencies of their own opinions, would exact from Catholics an almost superhuman measure of learning, acuteness, and self-command? We can only say, that we would not for the world that this letter should be seen by any Protestant friend or acquaintance who was in any degree awakened to a sense of the delusions in which he had been educated, and was turning a wistful eye towards the Catholic religion as the one, true, and holy faith given by Almighty God to man.

"Take, for instance, the astounding assertion, that he 'would prefer that a Catholic should read the *worst books of immorality*' than a Protestant Bible! If any of our readers have not already seen Dr. Cahill's letter, they will lift up their hands in astonishment, and question the accuracy of our quotation; nevertheless, we assure them that we are giving the exact words. Conceive, then, the effect of such a statement on the readers of the newspaper for which this letter was specially written. What story of Catholic wickedness will they not henceforth believe? What tale of priestly licentiousness will from this time be too monstrous for their credulity? The Protestant Bible has abundance of errors, it is true, and some of them of very serious importance; but is it not a violation of all common sense and decency, to pretend that a Catholic had better read the filthy productions of obscenity than the book in which these mis-translations occur? Is there a priest in the United Kingdom who would bear out Dr. Cahill in such a notion? Would not all, with one accord, denounce it as a perfect portend in the domain of morals and casuistry? We do not believe that Dr. Cahill himself would act on what he says. We do not believe that he would see a Catholic reading an obscene publication with more equanimity than he would see him reading the Protestant Bible. He is carried away by the excitement of newspaper controversy, and is betrayed into exaggerations which, in other moments, he would be eager to condemn. This single passage alone in his letter is a proof of the perils with which newspaper and platform contests on religious subjects are surrounded. We do not say that such subjects ought never to find their way into the columns of a Protestant journal, or that controversial discussions on theological topics ought never to be undertaken in public; but universal experience bears us out in alleging that such modes of treating the most sacred and delicate of subjects are rarely useful; and that, when they are undertaken, they require a sound head, a cool judgment, a disciplined temper, a prudent tongue, a contempt for clap-trap, and a desire to convince opponents, rather than to elicit the applause of indiscriminating admirers.

"What, then, must we think of the snares which beset the 'popular' controversialist, when we turn to the paragraph of Dr. Cahill's letter, in which he asserts that the miracle of Transubstantiation is 'a very common occurrence with God, and may be called one of the most general laws of nature?' He is carried away by the unfortunate desire to bring down the infallible mysteries of faith to the level of

human capacities; and which has led him into statements which, viewed merely as rhetorical illustrations, are inaccurate and worthless; but if looked upon as destructive of Catholic doctrine, are shocking to the last degree. Led on by the desire of confounding his adversary, he is like a boy playing at snowballs, who mingles dirt and stones with the pure snow, in order to hit his antagonist the harder blows. While heaping on the head of this Mr. Burns every epithet of scorn and contempt, for his stupidity, his ignorance, and his 'untheological' blunders, he proceeds to put forth the following exposition of the doctrine of transubstantiation."

After giving a long extract from Dr. Cahill's letter, the *Rambler* proceeds, p. 173.

"Setting aside, moreover, the theological bearings of Dr. Cahill's language, as an argumentative illustration of the mystery of the Real Presence it is worthless, and can serve only to mislead. The wonder of Transubstantiation is this, that, while the substance is changed, the visible and tangible accidents remain. How, then, does it assist faith to compare this supernatural condition of a visible object with natural changes, in which the substance remains and the accidents are changed? The difficulty, to human reason, in the Catholic doctrine, is the *non-alteration in the accidents*. In all chemical changes the accidents are more or less altered, and heretical unbelief asserts that no transubstantiation can take place without such alteration; and Dr. Cahill's illustrations will serve to confirm such unbelief. Protestants will reiterate their assertion that the whole doctrine is unmitigated nonsense, and that Catholics themselves do not know what they mean. Catholics, on the other hand, will reply to such illustrations, that they are in direct violation of the injunctions and declarations of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in which we are taught that *we have no example of the change wrought by Transubstantiation, either in natural changes or in the creation of things*. *Illud sepiissime a sanctis Patribus repetitum fideles admonendi sunt, ne curiosius inquirent, quo pacto ea mutatio fieri possit. Nec enim percipi a nobis potest, nec in naturalibus mutationibus, aut in ipsa rerum creatione ejus rei exemplum aliquod habemus* (Cat. Conc. Trid. pars 2, c. iv. 9, 41.)

"Dr. Cahill, however, is not content to stop here. He actually goes on to 'illustrate' this sacred mystery by a new 'explanation' of the Incarnation itself, which is a virtual denial of the very foundation of the Christian faith.

"Is it not mournful to reflect that in these days, when every one's eyes are turned towards the Church and her teaching, the columns of a Protestant newspaper should be filled with declamations on the very foundation of our faith, which, if they have any meaning at all, are a plain denial of the doctrine, which every child may read in the creed of St. Athanasius, that 'our Lord Jesus Christ is man, of the substance of His mother?'—p. 174.

"Of the letter of Mr. Burns, which has called forth this reply from Dr. Cahill, we know nothing more than is to be gathered from the extracts which the latter has prefixed to his rejoinder. Mr. Burns appears to be a person of the 'evangelical' school, who cannot help 'preaching,' even when writing to a Catholic priest. We dare say his whole production is foolish enough, and as 'untheological' as Dr. Cahill considers it to be; but we must say that, as far as Dr. Cahill has enabled us to judge, there appears to be nothing in it which should have provoked such contumely and violence as he has poured forth. On the contrary, there are indications of more modesty of thought than is common among persons of Mr. Burns's school; and which should naturally have called for a simple and kind-hearted explanation of Catholic doctrine, rather than for a storm of contempt. 'I think,' says Mr. Burns, 'the soul can no more feed on flesh and blood than on bread.' Surely such a statement, so expressed, required something different from a whole broadside of abuse.'—p. 175.

It is not merely the *Rambler*, however, that judges thus of Dr. Cahill's letters. The *Tablet* of Saturday, February 4, contains a letter from Dr. Cahill, written in his usual style, in answer to a letter written by the Rev. Edward Walford, lately a clergyman of the Church of England, but now a convert to Romanism. We have not seen Mr. Walford's letter, for the *Tablet* does not publish that, though it gives Dr. Cahill's reply; but Dr. Cahill gives us the following extracts from the letter of Mr. Walford:—"Now, sir, whatever means God may bless to the advancement of the Catholic religion in England, it is quite certain that false statements are not among them, and I cannot but deplore, in common with many other converts of the Catholic faith, the recklessness and uncharitable assertions which Dr. Cahill, a priest of the Catholic Church, is not ashamed to utter against the Protestant clergy." And, again, "When we urge upon them (the Protestants) the claims of the Catholic Church, and the superior fruits of holiness to be found within her pale, we are silenced by an allusion to the last speech, or letter of Dr. Cahill, who, surely, as a Catholic priest, would be doing equal service by teaching some of the Church's children in our semi-heathen towns, as by delivering fierce controversial lectures, and writing letters of ignorant and unchristian invective."

Mr. Walford, in changing his religion, does not think that he should cease to regard truth or be a gentleman. Dr. Cahill seems to think otherwise; for he accounts for Mr. Walford's letter, by telling him that he is "only half con-

verted"! Of course Dr. Cahill thinks that every one who is wholly converted, should prove it by using such language and arguments as Dr. Cahill's, and by speaking of Protestants as Dr. Cahill does.

We shall not trouble our readers with the unblushing self-glorification with which Dr. Cahill endeavours to console himself for the rebuke he has received. But there is another point worth mentioning. The *Rambler* says that we are not to suppose that Dr. Cahill's speeches and letters are approved by the Roman Catholic priests or bishops.

"We assure our non-Catholic readers that Dr. Cahill alone is responsible for the statements he puts forth, that there is no foundation whatever for the prevalent Protestant notion that he is to be taken as a chosen champion of the faith; but, on the contrary, that a very large proportion of the Catholic clergy and laity regard much of what he says as *pernicious and untrue*. Why, then, it will be said, is Dr. Cahill *allowed* thus to compromise the whole community of which he is a member?" (p. 176).

The *Rambler* goes on to say that the only reason that the Roman Catholic bishops do not stop Dr. Cahill is, "lest an unwilling subject should recalcitrate hopelessly;" in plain English, lest he should rebel against authority, and begin to kick like a vicious horse that nobody can stop!

After all the boasted *unity* of the Church of Rome, then, it appears, there is dissension enough within its pale. They have champions in one country whom they repudiate and are ashamed of in another, and can keep in subjection those priests only, however mischievous or heterodox, who are *willing subjects*, and not given to rebel or recalcitrate hopelessly! While, however, the *Rambler* excuses the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy for "permitting Dr. Cahill to write and lecture as he does," Dr. Cahill, on the other hand affirms, that his sermons have been preached, and his speeches made, on the "invitations of dozens of bishops, and hundreds of priests," to all of whom he can refer for their approval.

We trust this is but the vapouring of the man, and not the stating of a fact; and venture to hope that the time is coming when all Roman Catholic priests will see that controversial discussion, to be read or listened to, *must be carried on in the method of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, and not in the method of Dr. Cahill. We trust, therefore, our friends will excuse us for not selecting Dr. Cahill's publications as matters to be replied to, at least, till he is recognized by his Roman Catholic brethren as a fit representative of their views, and learns to conduct controversy in a more temperate and Christian spirit.

## Correspondence.

### ON THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Extreme pressure of business alone has precluded the possibility of my paying earlier attention to your remarks on my letter in the November edition of your paper. I regret that my observations should be, as you say, calculated to excite prejudice. Unfortunately, early prejudices are not easily subdued. Bishop Burnet says it is a noble effort of the greatest minds to shake off the prejudices of education; notwithstanding, as I have abstained from setting myself up as an advocate of any particular Church, and have contented myself with reasoning on doctrines abstractedly, I flatter myself there are many enlightened Protestants who will examine my arguments impartially, having flung, as I do, all such feelings of prejudice to the winds.

From a retrospective view of our controversy, it appears that I have so far prevailed as to establish against you at least, that the Church of England, as at present existing, is disowned by every Church, congregation, and society of Christians in the eleventh century. After sending me, in my search of truth, from Rome to Greece, Antioch, Alexandria, and the whole round of the eastern Churches—Copts, Muscovites and all—finding your principles rejected by each, you are constrained to cower under the patronage of Lanfranc. This pious and learned man was one of the most formidable opponents of Berengarius, against whom he wrote a book, expressly, in the very beginning of which he inveighs against Berengarius as an arrogant innovator, who began to broach opinions opposed to the whole world—"Superbiæ fastu plenus, contra orbem sentire coepisti"—and that he composed a work in opposition to truth, and to the persuasion of all Churches. "Contra Catholicam veritatem, contra omnium ecclesiarum opinionem, scriptum postea condidisti." In the 22nd chapter of his book Lanfranc thus expostulates with Berengarius:—"Ask all those who have any knowledge of Latin; ask the Greeks, the Armenians, and all Christians, without exception, of whatsoever nation, they will answer you that they hold the same faith that we profess." And Guimond, Bishop of Averse, a disciple of Lanfranc, says, in his 3rd book against Berenger, that he had not a single little town or little village favourable to his innovation, and that before Berenger had thus got mad no one had ever got mad after the same fashion—"Notissimum est hoc tempore priusquam Berengarius insanisset, bujusmodi insanias nunquam fuisse."

You say the present Church of England is identical with that presided over by Lanfranc. As few will be inclined to

believe the *ipse dixit* of individuals, however respectable, it remains for you to show the unbroken succession of your bishops from Lanfranc, and I doubt if even this will avail you; for I have demonstrated that you have not identity of doctrine, which is the true succession. St. Augustine says—"He that holds the same doctrine is of the same chair, and he who is an enemy to the doctrine is an enemy to the chair"—*Vide* 22nd, Orat. pro Athanas. (Paris, 1788.)

It will then be a polemical paradox for your ingenuity to reconcile how the propagation of the opinions of Berengarius can claim a succession from Lanfranc, who stigmatized and condemned them. Conscious that this position is like the rest, untenable, you adopt the theory, "that the Church need not of necessity be pure; that she is subject to error and corruption of doctrine, more or less dangerous, more or less extensive, in different ages and in different countries." This is perfectly intelligible, now at length; but if you are an accredited organ of Protestant opinion, it is evident, from the circumspection you have used in hazarding this opinion, that, after so many centuries of invention and refinement since the Reformation, you have not agreed among yourselves to concoct a regular theory of the visibility; that you have been depending on circumstances, and the penetration and perseverance of your correspondents to develop this your theory, or rather to extort it from you, at least that you felt some timidity on the subject. Such vacillation is inconsistent with professions of undeviating straightforwardness, and with the sublime sentiments embodied in the spirit of the LAYMAN.

If you once admit the principle of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, you open the door indiscriminately to all the heretics since the days of the apostles. You cannot draw a line of demarcation between the horde of heretics, and the several Churches of the eleventh century, which I have shown, upon your principles, to be corrupt, erratic, superstitious, blasphemous, and idolatrous. How will you reconcile the idea of such a chaotic amalgamation of heresy and schism, of superstition, blasphemy, and idolatry with the lofty promises made to the Church of the Messias? I humbly conceive that your ability and talents will be inadequate to the task. This is a startling picture of the true visible Church of Christ. These are the consequences which, with prophetic certainty, I foresaw from your application of the passages which you had explicated, or explicated, from St. Augustine. It hurts me not how mercilessly you have applied the lash of your criticism to an expression coined in a more illustrious mint than that of my obscure pericranium. No one in his senses doubts "the unspeakable foreknowledge of God," whereby he foresees future possibilities and events, such as the election of St. Paul, or of any other human being; but that such persons, whilst unconverted, or perhaps indifferent to any such thing, form a portion of the true Church, is what I will not subscribe to. Your method of proving this to be a true exposition of Protestant doctrine is singular, viz.—"the 6th article adopts all that is 'read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby.' I find this point in Gal. i. 15, 16." Hence it must be Church of England doctrine. In your major proposition you have misquoted the words of the Article, and, by substituting another minor proposition for yours, the Arians, or any other heretics, may prove themselves to be members of the Church of England. They should be obliged to you for so extraordinary a metamorphosis of the sixth Article.

Scripture passages on this point are quite plain—"A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid" (1st. iii. 10). "Shun those who cause divisions" (Rom. xvi. 17). "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away" (2 Tim. iii. 5). "If there come one unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John x.). Hear St. Augustine himself concerning schismatics, the Novatians and the Donatists—"They who believe the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and divinity of Jesus Christ, yet, if they do not communicate with the whole, wherever it is spread, it is evident they are not in the Catholic Church" (Lib. de unit. Eccl., cap. iv.). And, again—"All those who believe in Jesus Christ what faith teaches, but differ about his body, the Church, so that their communion is not with the body, but with some separate part, it is manifest they are not in the Catholic Church, and by reason of the few things in which they are not with us, the many things in which they are with us, avail them not" (Idem. cap. 3). The Donatists denied the efficacy of the sacraments administered by wicked men—(*vide* Confessio Augustana, Art. viii., Quid sit Ecclesia.) So much for your Biblical research, and for your accuracy in transmitting "the opinions which St. Augustine and Catholics then held."

Now, though I unhesitatingly admit that every individual Church is liable to "error and corruption in doctrine," I maintain that God has distinctly promised that he will have and keep a congregation of faithful men, free from error and corruption, to administer the sacraments, and to preach the Word of God in its purity, such as the compilers of the Thirty-nine Articles must have had in contemplation. This society, though they may be reduced to few in number, yet, having the Holy Spirit in their hearts, and God's never-failing Word to support them, will preserve the faith (1 Tim. vi. 20) and the form of sound words (2 Tim. i. 13), which they shall commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also (2 Tim. vi. 2). And though the gates of hell should rise up against them,

as in the case of the Arians against Athanasius, the agitation would inevitably convulse the face of society, producing a moral and religious revolution from which the faithful must come forth as gold from the furnace, repelling from them the unsound portion with a centrifugal power, and shine forth, "fair as the morn, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."—Cant. vi. 10. It is a matter of necessity, that many unregenerate and wicked men be tolerated in this communion of saints, whilst they subscribe to the orthodox formulæ of faith, according to the eighth article of the Augsburg Confession, above cited, for "in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour" (2 Tim. ii. 20); see also (1 Tim. iii. 15, and Rom. ix. 21).

Protestant controversialists boast that they are glad to catch Roman Catholics upon Scripture ground. Now, I cheerfully meet you on Scripture ground exclusively, anxious for the triumph of truth, and indifferent as to any ulterior object; and, for the sake of brevity, which with me is a great object, I will select only a few out of numberless passages of Scripture.

"Obey your prelates and submit yourselves," says the apostle (Heb. xiii. 17). Here is an injunction without qualification or limitation of time or place, from which it is most evident that the congregation of faithful men among whom the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacrament duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, must be perpetual and always visible; as the apostle would not command us to obey teachers of error and superstition, of blasphemy and idolatry.

St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15). All must admit that this refers to the Church visible, in which the apostle was giving Timothy, the bishop, instructions "how to conduct himself," as he says, "in his own absence." This establishes the moral and doctrinal purity of the Church of Christ, as corrupt and erratic Churches could neither support truth, nor be supported by truth.

Next (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20)—"Go teach all nations," &c. This most palpably refers to the Church visible; for Christ promises to be with the preachers, teachers, baptizers. If they could be invisible the whole order of the ministry, and even the martyrs may be invisible. Let no one say that this promise is confined to the Apostles. No; they were not to preach and baptize to the end of the world except through their lawfully constituted successors in the ministry. It is repugnant to common sense that He should be with apostates and idolaters; such an opinion is inadmissible, unless sanctioned by most positive and unequivocal assurance of Scripture.

(John xiv. 16, and xvi. 13) "I will ask the Father, and he will send you another comforter, to abide with you for ever," and "to teach you all things." The Apostles were not to live for ever in this life, except in their successors: hence this also refers to the Church visible.

Does the ever-memorable passage—"The gates of hell will not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18) refer to the invisible Church? By no means; the Ephesians, to whom St. Paul wrote, were visible; and so will the true Church of Christ, "the household of faith," to the end of time, be, in the same manner, "growing, and framed, and built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (Eph. ii. 19, 22).

Our Saviour is the head of his body, the Church (Col. i. 18), the spouse and everlasting husband (Eph. v. 23, &c.); so that she must be undefiled and pure, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. If any person should say that this refers to the Church invisible, I refer him to the "Controversial Manual," published by the British Reformation Society, page 113 (London edition, 1846), where, as a dissuasive from certain Roman Catholic devotional practices, the above passage is very pathetically applied to the visible society of Christians.

Read also, in the 54th chapter of Isaiah, the most solemn and encouraging, the most unlimited, unrestricted, and most unqualified promise of perpetual purity to the visible Church in successive ages (verse 9) "As I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be angry with thee, nor rebuke thee."

Verse 10—"For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, nor the covenant of my peace be removed from thee, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee." Verse 15—"Behold they shall surely gather together, but not by me, whosoever shall gather together against thee shall surely fall for thy sake;" and (lix. 21)—"My spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put into thy mouth shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever." And, again (lxii.) 6—"I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night." You would have these watchmen converted into "dumb dogs who bark not," in allowing the Church to be swamped with apostasy and idolatry without concentrating around them the faithful few, raising their hands and voices against corruption and error, and making their denunciations reverberate from shore to shore of each benighted and devoted land, till their testimony had been silenced by the torture of the scaffold or the flame.

In the Nicene and in the Apostles' Creed we profess our belief in the one holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church.

It is one by being "one body" (Rom. xii. 5), and "one spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 4 to 13). See, also, Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6, and it is holy by purity of morals, and preserving inviolate the doctrine of the apostles. No one can deny that this refers to the visible Church, as Bishop Pearson says in his exposition of the Creed—"The necessity of believing the Holy Catholic Church appears first in this, that Christ has appointed it as the only means to eternal life. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven, nor did He institute a Church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. There is no other name given under Heaven by which we can be saved but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under Heaven than in the true Church."

I call upon you, now, to establish the theory of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, by texts of Scripture, equally plain, obvious, and incontrovertible, at least as those I have adduced; and, also, to enter into an analysis of these latter passages, *seriatim* and *singulatim*, and to show that they are irrelevant to prove the contrary opinion. In so doing, if you resort to tortuous or far-fetched interpretations, I do not say that it will excite prejudice, for that would be unworthy; but I say it will excite the commiseration of every man of understanding and Christian philanthropy.

Respecting the Greek Church, I should have said, denying the Filioque procession, instead of "denying the Holy Ghost, the error of Photius." The latter clause should have qualified the former and rendered it intelligible; however the difference is not important in the present discussion. They are both fundamental errors.

My motives for not hitherto noticing the difficulty you have started as to the meaning of the word *sensualiter* were—first, I had resolved to adhere most strictly to the rule you had prescribed of "confining each letter to some one subject" (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, January 18, 1853, p. 10), one subject being more than I could do justice to within the narrow limits to which I am necessarily restricted. Next, I have been under the impression that your object was to lead me into a by-battle about Transubstantiation, which design I had resolved to frustrate, till you should have disposed of the subject of the visibility.

In the first place, then, I assert, most confidently, and without fear of contradiction, that *sensualiter* does not mean perceptible to the senses externally. *Sensibiliter* would be just the word for that precisely.

Secondly, *sensualiter* (if recognized at all) must mean in a manner capable of gratifying the animal passions, or of perceiving the enjoyment of such passions internally. I appeal to classical scholars to say whether this translation is not quite correct.

Thirdly, as the word *sensualiter* is not found in any vocabulary of words, either obsolete or post-classical, it is improbable that learned men, living in that region of classical literature, should be betrayed into such a solecism. I have never seen the place from which you quote, nor is there a great probability that I ever shall; but it occurs to me that it should be *essentialiter*, i.e., substantially, which is the identical word used in the Council of Ploisance, where the doctrine of Berengarius was condemned (Tom. 10, Conc. Lab. p. 502). Any scholar will immediately perceive how it may happen, by an aphorism of the first syllable *es*, and a transmutation or mistake of *u* for *i*. Such errors are frequent in transcribing, and even in print. I am satisfied that the emendation I have suggested is both rational and correct.

Hoping you will have the kindness to insert this letter in the next number of your periodical, I remain,

Φιλαληθης.

Dated 3rd February, 1854.

Our correspondent, of course, admits the distinction between the "articles of faith" and other religious opinions, for the Church of Rome admits it. If our correspondent had attended to this distinction, he might have left out a great part of his letter.

We conceive that the succession of a Church, as considered between the Roman Catholics and us, consists in a succession of its bishops, clergy, and people, holding the same articles of Christian faith: but we do not hold it necessary to the succession of a Church that all other opinions about religion should be the same at all times. We have always stated this distinctly, and without hesitation.

We say the Church in England holds the same articles of faith—the same Catholic creed—which were held in the Church over which Lanfranc presided; and that the present Archbishop of Canterbury has succession from him. And we think this enough to establish that it is still the same Church, although other religious opinions may have varied in it. "The succession of doctrine," as a necessary essential, must be confined to "articles of faith"—that is, "the Catholic creeds." We have no difficulty in showing that we got our "articles of faith" from the early Church. Roman Catholics cannot show that they got their articles of faith from the early Church. So our succession in doctrine is clear, and theirs is not.

Take, for instance, the public and solemn profession of his faith, which Pope Pelagius I., on being appointed to the See of Rome, in the year 555, made to Childebert, King of France. It contains the whole sum and substance of the three Catholic creeds, now held in the Church of England, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian: but not one word of the additional articles now in the

Roman Catholic creed. And then Pelagius adds, "THIS, therefore, IS MY FAITH." We can now take up that confession of Pope Pelagius, and say, as he said, "this is my faith." A Roman Catholic who takes it up must say, "this is only part of my faith; it is essentially defective, for it leaves out the very things which are most essential to being a Roman Catholic at all!" Which has preserved the succession of doctrine unchanged?

The succession of bishops in the Church of England and Ireland, and the succession of Roman Catholic bishops in England and Ireland, we are quite ready to discuss and compare; but as a separate subject.

Now, for our communion with the whole Church. We adopt the illustration which our correspondent produces—the case of the Catholics and Donatists. The Catholics always said to the Donatists, "we are ready to communicate with you on the principles laid down in the Word of God—the principles heretofore held in the Church." The Donatists refused those terms, and said, "we will not communicate with you unless you adopt our notions." The Church of England and Ireland, now and always, said to all other churches, "we are ready and anxious to communicate with you on the terms of holding the ancient and Catholic creeds, and doing all things lawful by the Word of God." The Church of Rome answers, "we won't communicate with you unless you profess all the things which we have added to the ancient creeds; nor unless you adopt all our practices, whether consistent with God's Word or not." Which party hold the principles of the Catholics, and which of the Donatists? Has our correspondent forgotten the address of St. Augustine, and all the Catholic bishops of Africa, to the Donatists, which was given in our number for July, 1853, p. 80. "If, therefore, it be inquired concerning the Church—what it is—how great it is—what sort it is—the *Divine Scriptures alone* are sufficient to point her out." Is not this what we say now? and do not Roman Catholics say that we must find the Church first, before we can use the Scriptures?

If our correspondent had attended to our statement that the profession of the articles of the Catholic faith—that is, of the Catholic creed—is essential to being any part of the visible Church, he surely would not have written such a passage as this—"If you once admit the principle of the moral and doctrinal corruption of the Church, you open the door indiscriminately to all the heretics since the days of the apostles; you cannot draw a line of demarcation between the horde of heretics, and the several churches of the 11th century." We reply that we have distinctly drawn the line of demarcation, and that line is the ancient Catholic creeds. Those who deny the articles of the Christian faith contained in those creeds, are out of the visible Church altogether; those who hold those articles, and yet bring in other religious errors, are corrupt. Why cannot our correspondent hold both these statements together? What contradiction is there between them?

We are not the first to hold that the whole visible Church, while it does not actually deny the articles of the faith, is yet liable to error. We learn this from St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitory*, c. 3, who plainly foresaw the danger—"What, then, shall a Catholic Christian do . . . if some new infection goeth about to corrupt, not in this case only a little part, but the whole Church? Then, likewise, shall he take care to cleave unto antiquity, which can now no more be seduced by any crafty novelty." Would any one write thus, who thought it impossible that error should creep into the Church?

We now come to our correspondent's texts of Scripture:—

"A heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid"—Titus iii. 10. Does that mean "avoid a man who holds the ancient Catholic creeds as the articles of his faith?" If not, how does it apply to us?

"Shun those who cause division"—Rom. xvi. 17. We offer to communicate with the Church of Rome on the basis of holding the ancient Catholic creeds, as the articles of our common faith: the Church of Rome refuses to communicate with us, unless we will consent to add new articles of faith to the ancient Catholic creeds. Who causes the division?

We agree with our correspondent, that God will always "have and keep a congregation of faithful men." Who were they in the days of Pope Liberius and the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia? That seems to be like the real question between "Philaethes" and us. We take the answer from St. Vincent of Lerins, who wrote about the year, 434. "Then, whoever was truly a lover and a follower of Christ, by preferring ancient faith before new error, was untouched with any spot of that infection."—*Commonitory*, c. 4.

But, our correspondent challenges us to the discussion of scripture texts, and we gladly comply.

"Obey your prelates, and submit yourselves," says the apostle, (Heb. xiii. 17). Here is an injunction without qualification of time or place." "Well, it needed no limitation to the Hebrew Christians at that time, when St. James was just dead, and Simeon had succeeded him as Bishop of Jerusalem. But what? No limitation at any time or place? Not in the time of Pope Liberius, or at Ariminum or Seleucia? That surely is too much! Let us be willing to learn the limitation from the same

apostle in another place (1 Cor. xi. 1)—"Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ." But surely not when Popes and prelates deny him!

"St. Paul calls the Church "the pillar and the ground of the truth." (Our correspondent leaves out the word in italics, although it is in the Douay Bible, which he quotes). But St. Paul goes on instantly to specify that truth of which the Church is the pillar and support; it is "the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh." God has ever had, and ever will have, a visible Church to support that truth in the world. But St. Paul does not say that the visible Church shall never adopt erroneous opinions or practices in other matters of religion.

"Go teach all nations, &c."—Matthew xxviii. 19. Ah, that little "and." It covers words which our Saviour spoke in the same breath, but which Roman Catholics do seldom quote. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The promise to be with them all days, extended to such teaching, and no farther. He commanded the apostles and those who followed them so to teach; he did not promise that Popes and Councils should never teach otherwise in anything.

John xiv. 16 and xvi. 13. We firmly believe that our Saviour promised his Spirit "to teach you all things," not only to the apostles and those who followed them in the ministry, but to all who believe in Christ. We do not believe that all priests, all councils, and (least of all) all popes, have always been willing to receive and follow that teaching; and where they do not, they go astray from the truth.

Matthew xvi. 18, will be treated elsewhere.

We are not acquainted with the "Controversial Manual," published by the British Reformation Society; nor would we consider its authority binding on us.

For a general answer to the passages produced from the prophecies of the Old Testament, we must refer to our answer to a "Celbridge Inquirer," when he produced similar ones, vol. i., No. 11, p. 130. Nov., 1852. Those prophecies are often capable of being applied to a future as well as to the present state of the Church. If no passage can be produced from the New Testament to prove that the visible Church must always be free from error, then we have no warrant for applying the Old Testament prophecies in such a way.

Our correspondent asks for some Scripture proof that the Church is subject to error. We refer him to St. John's Epistles to the Seven Churches (Revelation or Apocalypse, c. ii. and iii.), and to St. Paul's address to the clergy of Ephesus, (Acts xx. 30.) We could give many, but must be brief. What St. Paul wrote to the Church of Rome is, perhaps, most to the point, and is sufficient—"Thou standest by faith, be not high-minded, but fear. For if God hath not spared the natural branches (the Jews) (take heed) lest he also spare not thee. See, then, the goodness and the severity of God; towards them, indeed, that are fallen, severity; but towards thee the goodness of God, if thou abide in goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."—Romans xi. 20, &c. Could the apostle have written thus to the Church of Rome, if Christ had promised that the Church of Rome should never fall from faith, or be cut off?

Our correspondent seems to find it much harder to answer questions about the visible Church of Christ than we do. We asked him "is the Greek Church a part of the visible Church of Christ; yes, or no?" He refers to the Greek Church, but does not answer this. If he cannot answer it, surely his notions of the visible church must be much more perplexing to him than ours are to us.

But the great question we asked him was about the confession which Pope Nicolas II. and his council of 113 bishops, compelled Berengarius to sign. "Philaethes" brought this forward as an instance of the things in which we are bound to obey our prelates. In September last, and again in November, we asked "Philaethes," did he believe that decision of the pope and prelates to be right or wrong. Even now his answer to this is not very plain: he says the word "sensualiter" ought not to be there, and the word "essentialiter" ought to be in its place. We take this as a confession that it is impossible to defend the decision of the Pope and council, while this word stands in it. So far so good. Well, there is no denying that the word "sensualiter" is in the decision as it now stands in the canon law. But "Philaethes" thinks the Pope and Council never could have written that word there, and we must take it out, and put another word in its place. The word, he says, is not "classical," and "it is improbable that learned men, living in that region of classical literature, should be betrayed into such a solecism." We beg to assure "Philaethes" that in the 11th century, "classical literature" was wholly forgotten and unknown at Rome. The Latin of Popes and Councils at that time is as far from being classical as it is possible for Latin to be. "Philaethes" must not expect to find all the words they used in classical dictionaries; and if he will look at Du Cange's glossary,\* he will find that the word *sensibiliter* is no more there than the word *sensualiter*; but if he will take the trouble of consulting either Dr. Andrews's or Mr. Riddle's Latin-English Lexicons, following the Latin-German Lexicon of Dr. W. Freund, he will find the kindred word *sensualitas* translated "the capacity of sensation—sensitivity" which quite agrees with our translation of the word *sensualiter*—"in a manner appreciable by the senses."

The proof is beyond all dispute that *sensualiter* was the word really put in the Confession by Pope Nicolas II. and his bishops; for it was put in the canon law, and no copy of the canon law ever had any word but *sensualiter* in it. We have the first edition, printed in 1472, which has that word; and so has every copy since. In the year 1580 the Pope appointed twenty-four of the most learned men in the Church of Rome to correct the canon law; they spent sixteen years in the task. They got the oldest copies of the canon law from all parts of Europe, some as old as the time it was written, and every copy they found had the word "sensualiter;" and they left that word in it; and the Pope, by a solemn bull,\* forbid any one ever to alter one word of it. So here is proof past all question that "sensualiter" is the real word.

We are satisfied now that our correspondent feels that that confession, with the word "sensualiter" in it, was false and heretical, and that Berengarius was not bound in conscience to subscribe to it at the command of his prelates.

But, then, how can "Philaethes" now go on to contend that Christ has given such a promise to the prelates of being always right—that we must always, in every thing, submit to what they say, "without qualification, or limitation of time or place?"

## ON POPE LIBERIUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Will you be pleased to permit insertion to the following observations, assured, as I am, your only object (as, believe me, it is emphatically mine), is the solution of the truth. I therefore trouble you with these remarks, with reference to the alleged heterodoxy of the Pontiff Liberius, and which has been discussed in yours of January and December.

In the number for December, 1853, page 142, it is said, "At both Seleucia and Rimini the bishops passed decrees that the word 'Consubstantial' should be left out of the creed of the Catholic Church, thereby surrendering what the Arians wanted." Now, on consulting the "History of Decline, &c., of Roman Empire," I find it mentioned that the Seleucian Council, "after four days unavailing debate, separated without any definite conclusion." The Rimini Council, held in A.D. 359-60, appears to have signed a formula, "reluctantly obtained, partly by force, sophistry, and cold, and distress, &c.," by Valens, &c., Illyrian bishops, and the Prefect Laurus, who "deceived the honest simplicity of the Latin bishops by fraud," and got them to sign a captious creed, in which some expressions, susceptible of an heterodox sense, were inserted, in the room of the *ὁμοούσιος*, or "Consubstantial." As soon as Valens, &c., had received it, and the bishops had dispersed to their dioceses, he published it in the Arian sense; which they no sooner discovered than they immediately protested against such an interpretation, and "rejected it with disdain and abhorrence," and "the orthodox creed was more firmly replanted in the Churches of the west."

In view of all this evidence, this proof, how can the Rimini Council be charged with heterodoxy in doctrine—in doctrine, simply? Respecting the allegation of heterodoxy against the Pontiff Liberius, he does not appear to have been at Rimini: that is granted, and what is more, must have been in banishment in Thrace, at the time of its sitting, (having been so for three years, from 357 or 356?) not for refusing to sanction its decrees, but those of another council. Therefore, in view of this conclusion, the letter to which you refer, and which he certainly wrote to Constantius, had reference to the decisions of the Milan Council of A.D. 355 and 356, not to Rimini at all, which Milan Council was convened to ratify the decrees of Tyre Synod, held in 336, A.D., in which Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, had been sentenced to exile, on false charges, universally admitted such, and having no ostensible relation to articles of Christian doctrine, and with the breaking a chalice, imprisonment of six bishops, and even homicide!!! In view of these facts, Liberius's letter does not imply or prove any heterodoxy in doctrines, as far as I can perceive. His letter certainly exhibits more anxiety to regain his former position, and also great weakness, and deficiency of what was to be expected from a Roman Pontiff, the head of the Christian Church—high, unbending Christian moral principle—inasmuch as he most culpably betrayed and deserted the cause of a highly injured and calumniated Christian brother and archbishop, who, by his noble and firm determination, maintained his conscientious convictions in their integrity, during forty-six years, twenty of which he passed in exile, "almost every province of the empire successively a witness to his merit and sufferings," "displaying a superiority of character, and abilities,

\* We have a copy of the Bull of Gregory XIII. before us, prefixed to the edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, published at Lyons in 1671, from which we transcribe the following extracts:—  
"Ut omnem omnino hominum totius orbis licet hujusmodi libri dicti juris canonici addere, detrachere, vel immutare aut invertere, nullave interpretatione addungere, sed prout opus hujusmodi Romæ nunc impressum fuit, semper et perpetuo integrum et incorruptum conservetur, statimque sancimus et ordinamus."  
"Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die prima Julii MDLXXX., Pontificatus nostri anno nono."

This copy, like all the others—and we have consulted eight different editions, all published by authority—has the word "sensualiter" twice over.

\* Labbe and Coart, vol. v., p. 802. Edition, Paris, 1672.

\* Glossarium Medie et Infime Latinitatis, Paris, 1846.